

**CLARK COUNTY  
CLEAN WATER COMMISSION  
Meeting Notes**

Wednesday, October 2, 2002  
6:00 – 9:00 PM  
Amboy Middle School  
22115 NE Chelatchie Road  
Amboy, WA

---

**Call to Order**

*Roll Call*

Clark County Clean Water Commission Members Present

Robbie Agard, Willie Bourlet, Cal Ek, Anne Jackson, Mary Martin, Susan Rasmussen, Judy Schramm, Don Steinke, Art Stubbs and Virginia van Breemen

Clark County Public Works Staff

Earl Rowell and Henry Schattenkerk

Audience

Mr. Bourlet and Mr. Malinowski

*Introduction*

Mr. Kemper welcomes audience members and explains the reason the meeting is being held in Amboy. The members of the Clark County Clean Water Commission, Clark County staff, and guests were introduced. Two new Commission members introduced: Ms. van Breemen and Ms. Jackson. The meeting was called to order.

*Agenda and material review*

The material for tonight's meeting include:

- 10/02/02 Clark County Clean Water Commission Agenda;
- 9/4/02 Clark County Clean Water Commission Meeting Notes;
- Clark County Contacts (Staff);
- Clean Water Budget Report as of 9/25/02;
- Clean Water Program Supported Work: Ride Along.

*9/4/02 notes*

The minutes are approved with the following comments noted.

Mr. Ek doesn't agree with minutes regarding the statement that commission members asked staff to visit Mrs. Mitchell's parcel. He recalls members asking county staff to look into the matter only. Mr. Kemper asks Mr. Giese what the results were of that case. Mr. Giese replies that Operations has worked with her in the past and that any site visit to the parcel is on his way to or from work.

#### *Updates and Communications from the public, media or other agencies*

Mr. Kemper asks about communications with the public. Mr. Rowell responds that primary notification of meetings is given through local papers and asks the commission members for any suggestions to improve communication of meeting information to the communities. Mr. Steinke suggests an annual schedule of meetings included with the billings. Audience member suggests the same location in the same month each year and the posting of flyers in local stores or post office just before each meeting. Mr. Giese suggests utilizing community groups such as neighborhood associations. Commission members are receptive to all ideas.

Mr. Agard proposed and Mr. Ek amends

**Motion 2002-1002-05: I move to instruct staff to schedule dates for four meetings during the upcoming year to be located around the county. Amended to include more expedient announcements to the communities.**

*Motion is passed by all present Clark County Clean Water Commission Members.*

#### *Overview of Clean Water Program Efforts*

Mr. Kemper explains to the audience the history of the NPDES program and how it applies to unincorporated Clark County. He also explains how the fees were established and the reasoning behind the current structure.

#### *Public Comments*

Mr. Malinowski, representing the North Clark County Historical Museum, states he agrees with the Clean Water program in general, but would like the Clean Water Commissioners to recommend to the BOCC that tax-exempt non-profits groups, such as his, be exempt from paying Clean Water Program fees. He feels his facility does not contribute to the stormwater runoff problem and that the labor and time put into his facility are donated and the fee is extraordinarily burdensome.

Mr. Agard says the issue has been looked at before and no legal way to exempt non-profits has been found.

The Clean Water Commissioners discuss using educational credits for cases such as Mr. Malinowski's. Mr. Rowell reminds commission members that credits are based on land use and all like-use parcels would have to be treated the same, which could severely stress the budget. Discussion then turns to separating non-profits, such as churches, granges and museums from other type 4 parcels, perhaps by designating them into another category. At the end of the discussion, Mr. Malinowski is thanked for attending and bringing his case forward to the Commission.

#### *Overview of Capital Projects*

Mr. Kemper asks Mr. Giese for an overview of current and proposed Capital Projects. Mr. Giese first gives a summary of the Thomas Creek project. He answers questions from the commission members about its problems, history and funding before continuing with the Salmon Creek / Highway 99, Salmon Creek Lowland Treatment Ponds, and Salmon Creek / I-205 Bridge Treatment projects.

During the overview of the Stormwater Facility Retrofits, Mr. Agard objected to the use of CWP funds to repair the design flaws of previously built facilities. Mr. Giese offers to show the commission the initial list of problems and potential fixes for review, but understood from past discussions that design changes were an acceptable use of funds. Mr. Ek asks if the language of the permit addresses this issue. Mr. Swanson responds the permit does allow CWP fees to pay for changes in flawed designs. He adds that it is a cost-effective way to address stormwater issues since the county already owns these facilities.

Mr. Giese continues with an overview of activities involving other groups and agencies. Mr. Ek is concerned that making some of the program money available for cooperative activities will have too many outside groups wanting a portion of the funds and end up helping to finance other group's activities. Concern is also expressed that cooperative activities are included in the capital project budget. Mr. Giese reminds the group that capital projects aren't necessarily hard structural engineering activities but include projects such as riparian planting that are just as important to improving water quality. He also points out these "soft" activities lend themselves well to rural areas and helps to equalize distribution of water quality efforts between rural and urbanized areas. Most

commission members remain unconvinced and Mr. Ek suggests the commission should review applications for future partnerships as part of a granting process.

#### *Monitoring Overview*

Mr. Swanson speaks about some of the monitoring activities and summarizes the conditions of several county streams. The remaining audience member asks if the purpose of the monitoring data is to get better water quality. Mr. Swanson explains that monitoring is to track trends over time. Mr. Rowell adds that even now the program is trying to make more informed conclusions of the local water quality from data collected.

Mr. Swanson continues that he would like to adopt established methods used by the EPA and Oregon DEQ so direct comparisons can be made and results better understood. Older existing data can still be used as long as the limits are recognized.

County staff is asked if all the charts and graphs will include adequate explanation and recommendations for the general public. Mr. Stubbs states it will be the Clean Water Commission's work to make the recommendations based on the monitoring results. Ms. Rasmussen adds that when meetings are held in the communities, a summary of the nearby stream health should be incorporated into the agenda. Mr. Kemper adds that good water quality needs to be defined for the public. Mr. Agard wants the commission to begin making recommendations soon, but wants to know if there are any results to base decisions on yet. Mr. Rowell responds that short-term monitoring results are nearly complete, but also reminds the commissioners of the importance of long-term monitoring.

Mr. Agard asks Mr. Swanson if flow and rain gages are necessary to the program and questions the purpose of the volunteer project managed by Mr. Wierenga. Mr. Swanson tells the commission members the gages were part of a grant to monitor erosion to collect streamflow data, and operated by a retired USGS professional who has offered to do the job at considerable savings to the county. He also explains Mr. Wierenga has modeled the volunteer project after a successful project in Clallum County, and is a good tool for public involvement.

Mr. Swanson continues with a report on several recent cases of illicit discharge into the county storm drainage.

#### *Budget Overview*

Mr. Rowell reviews the latest budget information. Commission members question some of the budget numbers and wish for better "real time" information. Mr. Rowell mentions the pending Oracle-based financial reporting system, which may allow some more options for tracking budget numbers.

Mr. Stubbs mentions the staff handouts have too much internal jargon and would like future reports to the commission members and the public to be in layman's terms.

#### *Other items*

The commission members agree that staff presentations are helpful to understand specific activities within the program. Mr. Agard suggests each group at Water Resources submit a paragraph overview of their work for each meeting as well as one in-depth report from a group emphasizing accomplishments and budget needs and expenditures. There is general agreement among the members.

The commission requests Mr. Rowell to inform them of plans concerning new projects, contracts and employees so they can review and have input.

#### **Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned.

The next Clean Water Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 6 at 6:00. Location TBA.

*Respectfully submitted by Henry Schattenkerk*

